

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-10, 12, 13 and 15-24 are currently pending in the application. Claims 15-24 have been previously withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10, 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly being anticipated by JP 56 74212 ("JP '212"). Claims 1-10, 12 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly being anticipated by JP 61 137109 ("JP '109"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections based on JP '212 and JP '109 and submit that the pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites:

An optical ferrule comprising a ferrule body; wherein a concave portion in which a gate for resin molding is disposed is formed in said ferrule body, and a depth of said concave portion is deeper than a height of a flash which is formed in said concave portion as a result of said resin molding.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest the elements recited in independent claim 1.

More specifically, Applicants submit JP '212 does not teach, suggest or disclose at least "a concave portion" as recited in independent claim 1. As illustrated in Fig. 2, the JP '212 patent's cavity hole 414 (in which resin is inserted) simply does not correspond to the claimed concave portion with a gate for resin molding, as alleged by the Examiner. As such, JP '212 does not

disclose either a "concave portion" or "a gate for resin molding" disposed in the concave portion. Further, as illustrated in the JP '212 patent's Fig. 3, when the optical fibers are connected to each other using the connection tube 7, a flash is formed at a part on the optical fiber where the cavity hole 414 is disposed, and thereby prevents from sliding the optical fiber in the connection tube 7. Therefore, Applicants submit that at least the concave portion and the gate for resin molding as recited in independent claim 1 are not anticipated by JP '212.

Similarly, Applicants submit that JP '109 does not teach, disclose or suggest the elements recited in independent claim 1. For example, JP '109 does not disclose "a concave portion." More specifically, Applicants submit that element 13 in JP '109, Fig. 2 does not illustrate "a concave portion," as alleged by the Examiner. As such, Applicants submit that JP '109 does not disclose a "concave portion in which a gate for resin molding is disposed..." as recited in independent claim 1. Applicants submit that at least the concave portion and the gate for resin molding as recited are not disclosed in JP '109. Accordingly, if the Examiner maintains his assertion that the cited references anticipate the independent claims, Applicants request that the Examiner clarify his position regarding the "concave portion" and the "gate for resin molding" as claimed, with regard to the cited references. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited references.

Similarly, Applicants submit that that cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest the elements claimed in independent claim 12. Independent claim 12 recites *inter alia*:

An optical ferrule comprising a ferrule body, wherein a concave portion is formed for confirming confirmation factors such as a material of said ferrule body or sorts of optical fiber held in said ferrule body; and said concave portion is formed in a flange portion of said ferrule body, and a gate for resin molding is disposed in said concave portion.

As discussed above, Applicants submit that the cited references do not disclose forming a "concave portion." Applicants submit that neither the JP '212 patent, nor the JP '109 patent disclose "a concave portion formed for confirming confirmation factors such as a material of said ferrule body ..."; "said concave portion is formed in a flange of said ferrule body"; or "a gate for resin molding is disposed in said concave portion" as recited in independent claim 12. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 12 is not anticipated by the cited references.

CONCLUSION


For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 12 are patentably distinct from the cited references. Furthermore, Applicants submit that claims 2-10 and 13, which directly or indirectly depend on independent claims 1 and 12 respectively, are also patentably distinct from the cited references for at least similar reasons. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of these grounds of rejection.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Response to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 14998-255. Although no petition for time is believed to be necessary, in event that an extension of time is required, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 14998-255.

Respectfully Submitted,
CHADBOURNE & PARKE, L.L.P.

Date: December 7, 2005

BY: 
Daniel C. Sheridan
Registration No. 53,585

Address:
Chadbourne & Parke, L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112
212-408-5100 Telephone
212-541-5369 Facsimile